

REMARKS

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 20 to recite “the network device” instead of “the router.” Given that claim 20, as amended, has proper antecedent basis, Applicant submits claims 20-25 are definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 12-25

Claims 12-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,134 B1 issued to Bass et al. (*Bass*). Applicant submits claims 12-15 are not anticipated by *Bass* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 12 recites, in part, outgoing multicast packets that are created without making multiple copies of the packet data. The Office action states that this concept is taught in the embodiment of Figure 6 of *Bass*. The discussion of Figure 6, beginning on column 11, line 30 makes frequent references to the elements/architecture of Figure 3. The process discussed with respect to Figure 6 is carried out by the architecture of Figure 3. With respect to Figure 3, *Bass* states that “the multicast/unicast solution logic 306 is responsible for replicating frames where an exact copy of the same frame are transmitted to multiple ports, replicating frames where unique copies of the frame is transmitted to multiple ports...” See column 6, lines 49-58. In other words, for multicasting, the

architecture disclosed in *Bass* makes multiple copies of the original frame, which is exactly the opposite of what is claimed in claim 12. Thus, *Bass* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 12. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 12 is not anticipated by *Bass*.

Claims 13-19 depend from claim 12. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 13-19 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons claim 12 is not anticipated.

With respect to claim 20, claim 20 recites both a first memory unit and a second memory unit. Figure 3 of *Bass* merely discloses a single memory unit. Thus, *Bass* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 20. Claims 21-25 are not anticipated for at least the same reasons claim 20 is not anticipated.

Claims 1-11 and 26-28

Claims 1-11 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,134 B1 issued to Bass et al. (*Bass*). Applicant submits claims 1-11 and 26-28 are not obvious in view of *Bass*.

Similar to claim 12, claim 1 recites, in part, creating a plurality of outgoing multicast packet without making multiple copies of the packet data. Claim 26 recites similar limitations. As discussed above, the architecture of *Bass* requires that multiple copies of frames be made in order to carry out multicasting. Thus, *Bass* fails to disclose at least one limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits claims 1 and 26 are not obvious in view of *Bass*.

Claims 2-11 and 27-28 depend from claims 1 and 26, respectively. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they

depend, Applicant submits claims 2-11 and 27-28 are not obvious for at least the same reasons claims 1 and 26 are not obvious.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: December 19, 2007

/Jared S. Engstrom/
Jared S. Engstrom, Reg. No. 58,330
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: December 19, 2007

/Katherine Jennings/
Katherine Jennings